DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 629 CS 508 809

AUTHOR Vasquez, Gabriel M.; Taylor, Maureen
TITLE A Cultural Approach to Public Relations Research: An Extension of Hofstede's Variables to Grunig's Models of Public Relations.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (80th, New Orleans, LA, November 19-22, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Context; *Cultural Influences; Global Approach; Higher Education; Models; Pilot Projects; *Public Relations
IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior; Research Suggestions; World Views

ABSTRACT

A pilot study internationalized an existing set of four models of public relations and field tested an instrument that represents a cultural approach to public relations practice. The instrument is based on a combination and extension of G. Hofstede's views of culture as mental programs comprised of values about power, distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individualism-collectivism, and J. E. Grunig's four models of public relations practice based on the direction and purpose of communication behavior. Subjects, 94 of 134 active public relations practitioners and researchers in an urban midwestern city, completed the instrument which reflected cultural variables, models of public relations, and demographic information. Results indicated that: (1) power distance correlated with both of the one way models of public relations, press agentry and public information; (2) Hofstede's uncertainty avoidance dimension correlated with the public information model only; (3) the separated index of femininity correlated with both the two-way asymmetrical and two-way symmetrical models; and (4) both individualism and collectivism correlated with each of the two way models. Future research should continue to administer and refine the model with data from outside the continental United States. (Contains 27 references.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 629

A CULTURAL APPROACH TO PUBLIC RELATIONS RESEARCH: AN EXTENSION OF HOFSTEDE'S VARIABLES TO GRUNIG'S MODELS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Gabriel M. Vasquez
Department of Communication
2115 LAEB, Purdue University
W. Lafayette, IN 47906
Home (317) 423-5355

Maureen Taylor
Department of Communication
2115 LAEB, Purdue University
W. Lafayette, IN 47906
Home (317) 742-5208

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Vasquez
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS505809

Paper Submitted for Review to the ERIC Clearinghouse

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This paper advances a cultural approach to public relations research and practice through the extension of Hofstede's cultural dimensions to Grunig's models of public relations. Hofstede viewed culture as mental programs comprised of values about power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individualism-collectivism. Grunig developed four models of public relations practice based on the direction and purpose of communication behavior. Combined, the Hofstede-Grunig dimensions result in a quantitative instrument that advances the concern for culture as a significant variable in public relations research. A cultural approach to public relations research contributes to theory-building by moving beyond the assumptions of any one nation.

"In the United States, we tend to think that we are the most advanced system in knowledge of public relations and in development of public relations as a profession" (Sharpe, 1992, p. 103). Activities by practitioners and educators from Ivy Lee and Edward Bernay to Carl Botan and James Grunig are a testament of the advancements in public relations that originated in the United States. The world, however, is changing rapidly. Countries such as Nigeria, Turkey, Brazil, Africa, and the European community have made major advances in public relations research and practice (Sharpe, 1992). Many of these advances are driven by communication technology, the realignment of economic power, major common issues with no political or national boundary, and the prospect of world peace (Epley, 1992). The changing world has caused the people of the world to become more interdependent, our global society to grow closer together, and has resulted in significant variations and opportunities in the field of public relations (Epley, 1992).

One such opportunity has been the emergence of culture as a key variable in public relations research and practice. Generally, researchers have focused on the description of public relations practice in a specific country. For example, Pratt (1985) reported on public relations practice in Africa; Sriramesh (1992) provided ethnographic evidence from India; and, Karim (1989) discussed public relations in Malaysia. A handful of researchers have attempted to develop a schema for describing and categorizing differences in public relations practice between cultures and nations (Botan, 1992; Wheeler, 1990). Even fewer researchers have attempted to conceptualize culture as a variable in public relations research and practice (Sriramesh, Grunig, & Buffington, 1992; Sriramesh & White, 1992).

The purpose of this paper is to internationalize Grunig's models of public relations and field test an instrument as a cultural approach to public relations practice. Specifically, we extend and combine Hofstede's cultural variables to Grunig's models of public relations. Hofstede (1980, 1984) developed four dimensions of culture that he believed are prevalent across cultures and affect the functioning of any organization in a culture. Grunig (1984) developed four models of public relations practice based on the direction and purpose of communication behavior.

Hofstede's variables combined with Grunig's models of public relations result in a cultural investigation of public relations practice. A cultural approach to public relations research contributes to public relations as an applied social science by moving beyond the public relations assumptions of any one nation. In this paper, we provide a (a) synthesis of research on culture as a variable in public relations research and practice, (b) field test and report results of an instrument that combined Hofstede's cultural variables and Grunig's models of public relations, and (c) discussion of a cultural approach to public relations research.

Culture as a Variable in Public Relations Research and Practice

Culture is a relatively new and emerging variable in public relations research and practice (Botan, 1992; Epley, 1992; Sharpe, 1992; Sriramesh, J. Grunig, & Buffington, 1992; Sriramesh & White, 1992). In organizational communication literature, "the buzzword 'culture' does not have a unanimously accepted definition" (Sriramesh, Grunig, & Buffington, 1992, p. 580). Organizational culture, however, has been referred to as "the sum total ways of living, organizing, and communing built up in a group of human beings and transmitted to new comers by means of verbal and nonverbal communication" (Bormann, 1983, p. 100). Although as a concept culture has been investigated in many other disciplines, only recently have public relations researchers and practitioners recognized the significance of culture as a variable that affects public relations.

Research into the role and influence of culture reflects a growing concern for ethnocentrism and the values of a given group of people (Sriramesh et al., 1992; Sriramesh & White, 1992; Botan, 1992; Paluszek, 1989; Hofstede, 1984). Ethnocentrism in public relations is a belief that what is known about public relations in one country is applicable across all countries (Botan, 1992). Due to uneven developments of public relations research and practice as an outgrowth of activities in the United States, many other nations replicate public relations techniques from the United States (Sriramesh et al., 1992). Replication of U.S. public relations techniques, however, begs the question of whether or not U.S. theories, models, practices, and assumptions are comprehensive and appropriate to explain global public relations practice. Indeed, Sriramesh &

White (1992) identify "a need for studies that should not only seek to identify the public relations practice of organizations in different nations but also seek to identify whether the theories conceptualized in the United States adequately explain these practices" (p. 599). Further, Paluszek (1989), the past President of the Public Relations Society of America, noted, "public relations is moving into a golden age. It is arguably evolving into a central element, a keystone of our society ...It is adaptable to virtually any environment...because at its core, people count, their feelings count, their culture and values count" (p. 22). Botan (1992) captures the inherent paradox of the struggle to understand culture as a variable in public relations when he commented that the very practices that enable us to understand public relations practices in Japan and Western Europe may be blinding us from seeing other practices of public relations throughout the developing world. A concern, thus, for ethnocentrism and the values of a given group of people is an attempt to recognize public relations as a complex process that can be understood by moving beyond the basic, taken for granted assumptions of the public relations research and practice of any one nation.

Culture is externally and internally linked to public relations. Externally, culture, as the societal culture of a nation, affects the way organizations conduct public relations (Sriramesh et al., 1992). Societal culture is linked to public relations through the assumptions of communication and public relations practice (Sriramesh & White, 1992; Sriramesh et al., 1992). Sriramesh and White (1992) argued for the link between communication, culture, and public relations:

> the linkage between culture and communication and culture and public relations are parallel because public relations is primarily a communication activity. Hall (1959) saw such a strong interconnection between the two concepts that he remarked, "culture is communication and communication is culture" (p. 191). We contend that because a society's culture affects the pattern of communication among members of a society, it also should have a direct impact on the public relations practice of organizations because public relations is first and foremost a communication activity. (p. 609)

Sriramesh and White (1992) further identified the conceptual link between societal culture and assumptions of public relations through J. Grunig's (1989) asymmetrical and symmetrical worldviews held by public relations practitioners. Practitioners of the asymmetric worldview approach public relations as unbalanced, one-way communication for the benefit of the organization. Practitioners of the symmetric worldview approach public relations as balanced, two-way communication for mutual understanding or a negotiated state of affairs with publics.

Corporate culture, as an internal organizational variable, has a direct and indirect effect on the public relations practice of an organization. Dominant power holders in an organization, the CEO and key managers, identify key constituencies in the environment and target these constituencies for communication (Grunig, 1992). If public relations practitioners are members of the dominant power, then practitioners have a direct effect on the (a) assumptions of public relations, (b) identification of key constituencies to the organization, and (c) type of communication and models of public relations practiced by the organization. If public relations practitioners are not part of the dominant power, then the public relations practice of an organization is affected by the dominant power holders schema for public relations, the potential of the public relations department, and the culture of the organization (Sriramesh et al., 1992). Either directly or indirectly, culture influences the public relations practice of an organization by "providing a broad base of worldview, meaning, and values that affect all decisions in the organization--including the choice of a model of public relations and its purpose" (Sriramesh et al., 1992, p. 579).

Through assumptions of communication and public relations, societal culture greatly influences but differs from corporate culture. Societal culture is comprised of the assumptions of communications and public relations practice of a nation "imported into the organization through its employees" (Sriramesh & White, 1992, p. 600). Corporate culture consists of the assumptions of communication and public relations as held by the dominant power holders and practiced by the organization (Sriramesh et al., 1992). Societal culture imposes assumptions of communications and public relations on the corporate culture of an organization. Corporate culture need not be

entirely consistent with societal culture. Organizational assumptions of communication and public relations, however, are embedded in broader societal assumptions of communication and public relations and, thus, are affected by societal assumptions.

In summary, public relations researchers and practitioners have begun to examine the role and influence of culture as a key variable that affects the public relations practice of an organization. Externally, societal culture affects an organization by imposing assumptions of communications and public relations practice on the organization. Internally, corporate cultural assumptions of communications and public relations, as held by the dominant power holders, have a direct and indirect effect on the organizational practice of public relations. Generally, research into the role and influence of culture has tended to examine dimensions or categories that affect organizational culture (Schein, 1985; Smircich, 1983; Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Hofstede (1984), however, is one of a few researchers that has attempted to examine both societal and organizational culture. In the next segment, we summarize Hofstede's work as a prelude to conceptualizing a cultural approach to public relations research.

Hofstede's Cultural Variables

Hofstede (1984) reported on the work-related attitudes and values of the HERMES corporation (identity masked), a multinational corporation in over 40 countries. Hofstede defined culture as

> the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another. This is not a complete definition, but it covers what I have been able to measure. Culture in this sense, included systems of values; and values are among the building blocks of culture" (p. 21).

For Hofstede, then, cultural values are mental programs that are "partly unique, partly shared" (p. 15), "take both the person and the situation into account' (p. 14), and "leads to the same person showing more or less the same behavior in similar situations" (p. 14). Through mental programs, culture is to human groups what personality is to the individual (p. 21).

Hofstede (1984) identified three levels of cultural values: universal, collective, and individual. Universal level values are the least unique and most basic of mental programs shared by all humans and included expressive behaviors such as laughing and weeping (p. 15). Collective level values are shared with some but not all people, "they are common to people belonging to a certain group or category" (p. 15). Individual level values are the most unique and provide for a wide array of behaviors within the same collective culture (p. 15).

Results of Hofstede's (1984) study identified four principal dimensions of culture: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individualism-collectivism. Power distance points to the basic differences in inequality across cultures (p. 65). Uncertainty avoidance refers to the ability for humans to cope with uncertainty (p. 176). Masculinity-femininity alludes to the duality of the sexes (p. 176). Individualism-collectivism refers to relationships between the individual and the collectivity in a society (p. 148).

Hofstede (1984) asserted that these four variables are prevalent across cultures and will affect the functioning of any organization in a culture to various degrees. For public relations, Hofstede's variables affect the assumptions of communication and practice of public relations both in the organization and in societal culture. When combined with Grunig's models of public relations, Hofstede's variables bring a cultural and international perspective to public relations research and practice. To date, a handful of researchers have attempted to qualitatively apply Hofstede's cultural variables to examine the public relations practice of other countries to determine whether or not J. Grunig's models are applicable across nations. But, there have been no studies in public relations that have attempted to apply Hofstede's variables quantitatively. A review of J. Grunig's models of public relations, however, provides an opportunity for empirical analysis.

Grunig's Models Of Public Relations

In recent years, some progress has been made in the conceptualization, operationalization, and empirical verification of four models of public relations behavior and practice. Much of this progress reflects the work of James Grunig, a scholar at the University of Maryland. In this

segment, we provide a conceptual review, rather than details of research findings, of efforts to operationalize and verify four models of public relations communication behavior.

Grunig (1976) explored the communication behavior of public relations practitioners. Grunig conceptualized communication using Thayer's (1968) two modes of communication, synchronic and diachronic. In public relations, synchronic communication is one-way manipulative communication that attempts to synchronize the behavior of publics with the organization; diachronic communication is a two-way exchange of information that seeks a cooperative or negotiated state of affairs for the benefit of both the organization and public. Grunig was successful at correlating types of organizations with the two types of public relations communication behaviors. The relationships in the data, however, did not fit a logical pattern that could be explained by two types of public relations communication behavior.

Grunig (1984) re-conceptualized the public relations models to develop four models of public relations. The previous two models "over-simply actual public relations behavior, mostly because they assume all one-way communication must be manipulative or asymmetric and that all two-way communication will be informative and symmetric"(p. 8). In other words,

> public relations behavior seems to vary along two independent dimensions rather than one--one-way versus two-way and asymmetric versus symmetric. It follows, then, that there should be four models of public relations, which represent the combination of the two dimensions" (p. 8).

The one-way versus two-way distinction alludes to the direction of communication; one-way disseminates information, two-way exchanges information. The asymmetrical versus symmetrical contrast refers to the purpose of public relations as an unbalanced communication relationship, whereby organizations attempt to change publics, or as a balanced communication relationship, whereas either organization or public can adjust the relationship. Initially, the four models were tested by Grunig and his students with a 27-item questionnaire, with eight-item indexes for each

model. As a result of this analysis, the questionnaire items were revised and rewritten to increase reliability.

Grunig and Hunt (1984) and Grunig (1989) further conceptualized the four models of public relations practice. Grunig & Hunt (1984) defined the four models as historical stages in the development of public relations in the United States. In their discussion of the historical perspective of the four models, Grunig and Hunt concluded that organizations practice variations and combinations of the four models as the earlier models were not replaced when the newer models developed. Grunig (1989) argued for the four models as worldviews that exist on a craft-professional continuum: the craft or scientific models reflect a dominant worldview of public relations practice as a way of manipulating publics for the benefit of the organization; professional or excellent models represent an emerging world view of public relations as two-way information exchange for the benefit of the organization, the public and society.

In the most recent explication of the four models, Grunig and Grunig (1992) discussed the extent to which the four models are valid and reliable descriptions of how public relations is practiced. Concurrent validity is established through correlation of the six dimensions "with the four public relations roles developed by Broom and Dozier (1992)" (p. 295). In terms of reliability, the authors cite a variety of unpublished master's theses to describe the quantitative and qualitative methods utilized to measure the four models. More often, researchers have employed a quantitative questionnaire based on six dimensions and eight questions for each model (p. 294). Moreover, Grunig and Grunig argued that the four models of public relations are both normative, in that they describe two public relations should be practiced, and positive, in that they describe how public relations actually is practiced (p. 2901).

What began for Grunig as an investigation of the communication behaviors of public relations practitioners has developed into the validity and reliability of two independent dimensions of public relations communication behavior that, when combined, (a) result in four models of public relation practice (b) parallel and describe the history of public relations practice, (c) identify

the dominant and emerging worldview in public relations practice, and (d) provide a reliable and valid instrument for measuring the four models of public relations practice.

If Hofstede's cultural variables and Grunig's models of public relations practice are combined, then scholars may have a means to examine cultural variations in the models of public relations and in the public relations practice of any one country. In the next section, we argue for the combination of Hofstede's variables and Grunig's models of public relations as a cultural approach to public relations research.

Extension Of Hofstede's Variables To Grunig's Models Of Public Relations

Technically, Hofstede's variables have been extended to Grunig's models of public relations through ethnographic and qualitative methods. We acknowledge that researchers have utilized Hofstede's variables to investigate whether or not Grunig's models are applicable to other nations and that these research efforts have resulted in significant contributions to the body of public relations knowledge. Our view, however, is for a quantitative extension of Hofstede's variables to Grunig's models of public relations. This section argues for the quantitative extension of Hofstede's variables to the models of public relations and proposes research questions for a field test of a pilot instrument to examine work-related values of public relations practice.

There are several arguments that support the quantitative extension of Hofstede's variables to Grunig's models of public relations. First, as previously discussed, public relations researchers and practitioners have begun to recognize the role of ethnocentric assumptions in public relations. The consideration of culture represents an interest to advance beyond the public relations assumptions of any one nation. Generally, the quantitative extension of Hofstede's variables to Grunig's models further recognizes the role and influence of culture in public relations research and practice. Second, Hofstede's variables allow for an examination of the behaviors and work-related attitudes of public relations in association with each of Grunig's models. Hofstede's cultural dimensions provide insight into the distribution of power, the ability to cope with uncertainty, gender roles, and the individual-society relationship of the public relations models.

Extended to Grunig's models, Hofstede's cultural variables provide for the identification and indepth explanation of the power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculine-femininity, and the individual-collective values, attitudes, and behaviors of public relations practitioners in each of the Grunig models. Third, the use of Hofstede's variables provide for a transactive explanation of work-related cultural values and public relations practice. Work-related cultural values and public relations practice are transactive: Work-related cultural values influences the nature of public relations practice. Public relations practice contributes to and influences the nature of work-related cultural values. Hofstede provides a definition of culture as the collective programming of the mind in terms of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculine-femininity, and individual-collectivism. Moreover, empirical analysis may identify the nature of the relationships between and among these dimensions so as to explicate the transactive nature of cultural values and public relations practice. Finally, the extension of Hofstede's variables to Grunig's models of public relations represents a cultural approach to public relations research that can potentially determine public relations practice across and between nations. Much of the research that has resulted in the recognition of culture as a significant variable in public relations was undertaken to determine if Grunig's models apply to public relations in other nations. Hofstede's cultural dimensions, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculine-femininity, and individualism-collectivism, were deductively and inductively developed from over 100,00 respondents in 40 countries.

Problem Statement

The combination of Hofstede's variables and Grunig's models allows for the inclusion of cultural variables in the dominant models of public relations practice--a cultural approach to public relations research. Hofstede's variables define and operationalize culture as the power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individual-collective programs of the mind. Operationally, these variables can be utilized to examine work-related cultural values and their impact on an organization. Hofstede's cultural variables, however, do not provide insight to models of public relations practice. Grunig's models reflect four types of public relations behavior

and practice. The models, however, do not include and operationalize culture or cultural variables such that the work-related values of public relations practice are explicated. Moreover, this combination provides a common framework that can be applied to other nations for eventual determination of the public relations practice across and between nations.

An extension of Hofstede's variables to Grunig's models results in a quantitative instrument that explicates work related cultural behaviors of public relations practice. Both Grunig and Hofstede have developed valid and reliable instruments to test for their respective models and dimensions. Hofstede used a quantitative questionnaire to account for power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individual-collective cultural dimensions. Grunig used a quantitative questionnaire to identify models of public relations.

A combination of the Hofstede and Grunig dimensions into a single instrument would extend the models of public relations practice to account for cultural variables and potentially provide additional insight to the cultural behaviors of public relations practice. Given the potential for combining the Hofstede and Grunig dimensions as a single instrument, a field test of the instrument was conducted to examine the relationship between the cultural variables and the models of public relations. The research interest was in the strength of the relationship between the cultural variables and each model of public relations practice.

RQ1: Are the power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individual-collective cultural dimensions associated with the press agentry model of public relations?

RQ2: Are the power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individual-collective cultural dimensions associated with the public information model of public relations?

RQ3: Are the power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individual-collective cultural dimensions associated with the two-way asymmetrical model of public relations?

RQ4: Are the power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individual-collective cultural dimensions associated with the two-way symmetrical model of public relations?

As previously discussed, Grunig and Grunig (1992) argued for the conceptualization of the models as craft and professional worldviews of public relations practice. In addition to each model, then, this investigation was interested in the strength of the relationship between the cultural variables and the craft and excellent worldviews, respectively.

RQ5: Are the power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individual-collective cultural dimensions associated with the craft worldview of public relations practice?

RQ6: Are the power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and individual-collective cultural dimensions associated with the excellent worldview of public relations practice?

Although seemingly simplistic, these research questions represent the combination of worldwide cultural variables and dimensions of communication behaviors that explain the dominant models of public relations practice. The combination of cultural variables with the models of public relations represents an effort to move beyond the public relations assumptions of any one country to examine the work-related cultural behaviors of public relations practice. This cultural approach to models of public relations practice provides a common framework to potentially examine public relations practice across and between nations. The result is a pilot study of a cultural approach to public relations research and practice.

METHOD

Subjects

The PRSA Chapter of an urban Midwestern city was requested to participate in a field test of the instrument. The Chapter membership represented various organizations including, but not limited to, for-profit businesses, non-profit organizations, private consulting agencies, academic

institutions, and governmental departments. Upon formal agreement with the Chapter Board, researchers received permission to survey members. Subjects of the investigation, thus, were 134 active public relations practitioners and researchers.

Procedures

Instrument Development. Researchers requested and received a copy of the instrument used in the Grunig et al. (1992) IABC study to determine the models of public relations practice. Sixteen questions, four questions for each model, identify four models of public relations practice. These questions were reformulated to reflect organizational specific activities or practices. For example, the press agentry question "the sole purpose of public relations is to get publicity for the organization" was reformulated as "in my organization, the sole purpose of public relations is to get publicity for the organization." The goal of this reformulation was to provide for the examination of actual public relations practice. Accordingly, each of the sixteen questions were reformulated.

Hofstede's (1984) variables were reviewed to identify actual questions used by Hofstede to construct each cultural dimension. The power distance dimension consisted of four statements ("in this organization, subordinates are afraid to express disagreement with their supervisor; my supervisor usually makes decisions on his/her own and then expects the decisions to be carried out loyally without raising difficulties; my supervisor usually makes decisions on his/her own but before going ahead explains the reasons for the decisions and answers any questions; I prefer to work for any type of supervisor except for one who asks me for advice and then announces his/her decision and expects me to loyally implement the decision whether or not the decision was in accordance with the advice I gave). The uncertainty avoidance dimension was comprised of four statements (it is very important to follow organizational rules even if I think it is in the organization's best interest if I break the rules; it is important for me to work in a well defined job situation where the responsibilities and requirements are clear; it is important for me to have long

term security of employment; it is important for me to have very little tension and stress on the job).

Both the masculinity-femininity and the individual-collective dimensions were reformulated from a continuum to individual dimensions. We posited that separate dimensions would result in greater insight and examination of the models and, thus, split Hofstede's continuum into two separate indexes. The masculinity dimension contained three statements (have an opportunity for high earnings; have an opportunity for advancements to higher level jobs; work in a modern, up-to-date company). The femininity dimension encompassed three statements (have a good working relationship with your direct supervisor; have good physical working conditions; have a friendly atmosphere). The individual dimension contained five statements (have sufficient time left for your personal or family time; have considerable freedom to adopt your own approach to the job; have challenging tasks to do from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment; fully use your skills and abilities on the job; have training opportunities to improve or learn new skills). The collective dimension constituted five statements (work with people who cooperate well with one another; make a real contribution to the success of your organization; serve your country; have an opportunity for helping other people; work in a small but desirable company).

The final instrument reflected cultural variables, models of public relations, and demographic questions. Questions related to public relations models were formatted using a nine point Likert type scale, from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Questions related to cultural variables were formatted on a nine point Likert type scale, ranging from not very important to very important. Demographic questions (e.g., gender, age, education level, income, type of work, type of organization) were included to obtain descriptive profiles of respondents.

Conducting the Research. The survey was administered via mail survey techniques. The target population was the active members of a local PRSA chapter. Each member received a cover letter that informed them of Board endorsement and approval, encouraged member participation, and set a return deadline. Received surveys were tracked, totaled, and a second mailing was sent

within a week following the deadline. Surveys were sent to all 134 members, with a total response rate of 78%. Surveys were then screened for usability, which resulted in the deletion of several surveys (N=94).

Data Analysis. Data was analyzed using SPSS on an IBM VMCMS mainframe. Prior to analysis, data was examined through various SPSS programs for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and fit between their distributions. Results of evaluation of assumptions identified no outliers or missing cases.

RESULTS

The application of Hofstede's cultural dimensions to Grunig's models of public relations represents an attempt to examine the role and influence of culture as a key variable in public relations practice. Hofstede (1984) discovered certain cultural dimensions, which transcend international boundaries, and have an influence on society as well as organizations in society. The extension of Hofstede's dimensions to Grunig's models of public relations practice resulted in a single instrument to examine work-related cultural variables and public relations practice. The six research questions concern the correlation of Hofstede's variables with the models and worldviews of public relations practice. Table 1 depicts the correlations between the models of public relations practice and Hofstede's cultural variables. To the extent possible, each of the research questions is discussed in relation to Hofstede's cultural dimensions.

Insert Figure 1 About Here

Press Agentry. Two of Hofstede' s cultural dimensions correlated with the press agentry model of public relations: power distance and masculinity. Power distance correlated with the press agentry model, $r=.3376$ ($p<.001$). The United States, according to the Hofstede study, falls on the lower end of the power distance index (PDI). In Hofstede's study, the mean of the 40

nations was 51, while the United States scored a mean of only 40. Respondents for this survey instrument scored on the low end of PDI with a mean of 4.2788. Masculinity also correlated with the press agentry model, r=.2533 (p<.014). The United States falls on the high end of the masculinity index with a mean score of 62, while the overall mean was 51. Respondents for this survey scored on the high end of the masculinity index with a mean of 7.4231.

Public Information. Three of Hofstede's cultural dimensions correlated significantly with the public information model of public relations: uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and collectivism. Uncertainty avoidance correlated with r=.2811 (p<.006). The United States falls on the low end of Hofstede's international scale with a mean of 46 as opposed to the overall mean of 64. Respondents for this study indicated a low uncertainty avoidance with a mean of 4.8654. Power distance also correlated significantly with the public information model of public relations, r=.2198 (p<.033, as previously indicated in the press agentry model, respondents in this study supported Hofstede's findings). Lastly, collectivism had a negative correlation with the public information model r=-.2756 (p<.007). The negative correlation reflects the United States ranking as the highest nation in the HERMES study in individualism (national mean of 91 versus the overall mean of 51).

Two-Way Asymmetrical. In what would appear as a contradictory correlation (that will be discussed more fully in the discussion section), the collectivism and individualism dimensions of culture both correlated significantly with the two-way asymmetrical model of public relations. Collectivism correlated with r=.2823 (p<.006) and had a survey mean of 6.6769. Individualism correlated with r=.21881 (p<.035) with a mean of 7.9615.

Two-Way Symmetrical. Three cultural dimensions correlated with this particular model: collectivism (r=.3228, p<.002), individualism (r=.2283, p<.027), and femininity (r=.2524, p<.014). Hofstede reported the United States as high on the masculinity-femininity index. However, for this study, we split Hofstede's single dimension into two separate dimensions; thus,

accounting for the correlation of a femininity index. Respondents scored high on femininity with a mean of 7.5000.

The Craft Worldview. Cronbach's alpha of the craft worldview resulted in a reliability score of .7553. This worldview had significant correlations with both power distance (r=.3106, p<.002) and collectivism (r=-.2345, p<. 023).

The Excellent Worldview. Cronbach's alpha of the excellent worldview resulted in a reliability score of .7882. This worldview indicated significant correlations with three cultural dimensions: collectivism (r=.3272, p<. 001), individualism (r= .2406, p<. 019), and femininity (r= .2171, p<.023).

DISCUSSION

This paper hypothesized that the Hofstede dimensions of culture could be combined with the Grunig models of public relations to create a survey instrument to examine work related public relations behaviors and values. The authors field tested this instrument in the United States and used the data to further conceptualize the relationships between public relations practice and culture. Research questions inquired about the correlation of the cultural dimensions with each of the models of public relations, as well as the two paradigmatic worldviews. Several observations about the correlations give us insight into the relationship between culture and practice. In this section, we discuss the importance of the cultural dimensions when integrated with Grunig's models of public relations.

Power Distance. Power distance correlated with both of the one way models of public relations, press agentry and public information. Hofstede's Power Distance Index is a continuum. Low power distance countries center on interdependence in organizations, decision making, and managerial style while higher power distance nations have a greater inequality in relationships (1984, p. 91). The Power Distance Index (PDI) offers several important insights for the public relations practitioner.

When this index is given to public relations managers and technicians it can first, inquire about practitioner perceptions in regard to admittance into the dominant coalition because it asks about relationships to authority. Public relations practitioners in this survey prefer manager's decision making style to be give and take, employees are less afraid of disagreeing with their boss, and practitioners desire and respect supervisors who consult with them before making a decision.

Second, the PDI informs the practitioner about the communication patterns within a organization. The index offers insight into the type of communication structure, centralized or decentralized, prevalent within an organization. Knowledge of the communication structure can assist practitioners in their public relations efforts both with internal and external audiences.

Lastly, Hofstede's Power Distance Index's extremely high correlation with the press agentry and public information models of public relations raises some important questions about the role of a practitioner within an organization and as well as the public relations mission of the organization. Do practitioners practice one way communication because their organizations have a centralized communication structure? Does a low power distance between a practitioner and his/her supervisor allow for more creativity and/or risk taking in decision making?

Uncertainty Avoidance. Hofstede's UA dimension only correlated with one of the one-way models, the public information model. The public relations practitioner can gain valuable insight into both the organization and the societal culture when considering uncertainty avoidance as a determining factor of behavior. For instance, a practitioner from a low UA nation may encounter many more formalized rules and procedures when working with/in a high UA organization. S/he may realize that management decision-making may be more cautious and open to "risky" or untried solutions to communication problems. Knowledge of the level of uncertainty avoidance within a society or organization can also help the practitioner plan for and execute public relations strategies that will serve the needs of the organization and adhere to cultural standards of conduct.

advancement and opportunities (this survey followed the assumption that masculinity and femininity are learned styles of interaction within a culture). Characteristics of public relations practice and attitude that may reflect this high correlation include a strong belief in continued training in the workplace, an opportunity to advance, an opportunity for high earnings and the opportunity to work in a modern up to date organization. The high correlation of Masculinity with the press agentry model of public relations may illustrate technician/practitioner desire to advance within an organization.

Femininity. Though both masculine and feminine characteristics are present within every culture, some cultures are more on one side than the other and thus can be characterized as either masculine or feminine (Hofstede, 1984). The separated index of femininity correlated with both the two-way asymmetrical and two-way symmetrical models. The Femininity Index looks at the sex role distribution within a society, not sex. This is very important distinction for the instrument. The field of public relations has been referred to as "feminine" and "pink-collared" as practitioners are comprised of a large number of women in both managerial and technical positions. By splitting the continuum into two discrete indexes, we probed further into the relationship of masculinity and femininity in the practice of public relations.

Individualism and Collectivism. It is the correlation of both individualism and collectivism with each of the two way models that invites questioning about the assumptions of these two models. These dimensions characterizes the relationship between the individual and the group within a given culture. Certain cultures view this relationship differently, some value the individual while others privilege the collective. We selected to split the continuum into two indexes in order to gain additional information about international practices of public relations.

One reason that both dimensions may have correlated with both of the two-way models is the nature of the role that public relations plays within the organization. Organizations require that both individuals and organizational units contribute to organizational effectiveness and productivity. One question remains, however, does a person leave their individuality behind when

they join an organization. We believe the correlation of both individualism and collectivism with the two-way models of public relations represents a reflection of the tension between the individualism of Americans and the collective task orientation of organizational membership. According to Hofstede, the United States had the highest national score on the Individualism Scale. Therefore, freedom of approach to a job, high desire for job challenge, and a desired sense of accomplishment through employing acquired skills describe the American practitioners in this survey. Moreover, both two-way models of public relations rely on research and information sharing to create and evaluate public relations programs. This cooperation of research and information sharing among individuals and organizational units perhaps leads to the high collectivity and individuality score on this survey.

In conclusion, this study has reported on the field test of a cultural approach to public relations research and practice. Results of the study, while encouraging, are limited by the nature of the sample. The PRSA Chapter of a Midwestern city provided a convenient sample. The research purpose, however, was to administer the instrument as a pilot study to examine the strength of the relationship between the cultural variables and the models of public relations practice, not to generalize about the nature of a specific sample. Future research should continue to administer and refine the model with data from outside the continental United States. All in all, the extension of Hofstede's cultural variables to Grunig's models of public relations advances the concern and consideration for culture as a significant variable of public relations practice and research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank Carl Botan and K. Sriramesh for their review of earlier drafts.

Table 1

Correlations Between the Models of Public Relations Practice and Hofstede's Cultural Variables

	Press Agentry	Public Information	Two-Way Asymmetrical	Two-Way Symmetrical	Craft Worldview	Excellent Worldview
Power Distance	r=.3376 (p<.001)	r=.2198 (p<.033)			r=.3106 (p<.002)	
Uncertainty Avoidance		r=.2811 (p<.006)				
Masculinity	r=.2533 (p<.014)					
Femininity				r=.2524 (p<.014)		r=.2171 (p<.023)
Individualism			r=.2188 (p<.035)	r=.2283 (p<.027)		r=.2406 (p<.019)
Collectivism		r= -.2756 (p<.007)	r=.2823 (p<.006)	r=.3228 (p<.002)	r= -.2345 (p<.023)	r=.3272 (p<.001)

References

Bormann, E. G. (1983). Symbolic convergence: Organizational communication and culture. In L.Putnam & M.Pacanowsky (Eds.) *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (99-127). Beverly Hills: Sage

Botan, C. (1992). International public relations: Critique and reformulation. *Public Relations Review, 18*, 149-159.

Broom, G.M. & Dozier, D.M. (1986). Advancement for public relations role models. *Public Relations Review, 7*, 37-56.

Deal, T.E. & Kennedy, A.E. (1982). *Corporate culture: The rites and ritual of corporate life.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Epley, J.S. (1992). Public relations in the global village: An American perspective. *Public Relations Review, 18*, 109-116.

Grunig, J.E. (1976). Organizations and publics: Testing a communication theory. *Journalism Monographs* No. 46 (November).

Grunig, J.E. (1984) Organizations, environments, and models of public relations. *Public Relations Research & Education, 1*, 6-29.

Grunig, J.E. & Hunt, T. (1984) *Managing public relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Grunig, J.E. (1989) Symmetrical presuppositions as a framework for public relations theory. In C. Botan & V. Hazleton (Eds.), *Public Relations Theory* (17-44). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Grunig, J.E. (1992) Communication, public relations, and effective organizations: An overview of the book. In J.Grunig, D.Dozier, W.Ehling, L. Grunig, F.Repper, & J.White (Eds.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (1-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Grunig, J.E. & Grunig, L.A. (1989). Toward a theory of the public relations behavior of organizations: Review of a program of research. In J.Grunig & L.Grunig (Eds.), *Public Relations Research Annual 1* (27-63). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Grunig, J.E. & Grunig, L.A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. In J.Grunig, D.Dozier, W.Ehling, L. Grunig, F.Repper, & J.White (Eds.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (285-326). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Hall, E.T. (1959). *The silent language.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Hofstede, G. (1980).

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequence.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Karim, H. (1989). development of public relations in Asia/Pacific: A Malaysian view. *International Public Relations Review,* 12, 17-24.

Paluszek, J. (1989). Public relations in the coming global economy. *Vital Speeches of the Day,* 56, 22-26.

Pauchant, T. & Mitroff, I.I. (1988). Crisis prone versus crisis avoiding organizations: Is your 53-63.

Pratt, C. (1985). The African context. *Public Relations Journal, 41,* 11-16.

Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sharpe, M.L. (1992). The impact of social and cultural conditioning on global public relations. *Public Relations Review,* 18, 103-107.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 28, 339-358.

Sriramesh, K. (1992). Societal culture and public relations: Ethnographic evidence from India. *Public Relations Review,* 18, 201-211.

Sriramesh, K., Grunig, J.E. & Buffington, J. (1992). Corporate culture and public relations. In J.Grunig, D.Dozier, W.Ehling, L. Grunig, F.Repper, & J.White (Eds.), *Excellence in*

public relations and communication management (557-596). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Sriramesh, K. & White, J. (1992). Societal culture and public relations. In J.Grunig, D.Dozier, W.Ehling, L. Grunig, F.Repper, & J.White (Eds.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (597-616). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates,

Thayer, L. (1968). Communication and communication systems. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Wheeler, T. (1990, May). The role of the European community in promoting the professionalism and harmonisation of public relations within the member states. Paper presented to the International Communication Association Conference, Ireland.